



Court Eastern District Of Virginia

United States District

Richmond Division

GEORGE ALEXANDER YARID PLAINTIFF

V.S.

COMPLAINT

ACTION CASE NUMBER 3:10-CV-143

JEAN JACK GIBSON, LUIS B. CALEX, HARRY BENSON

To Honorable Judge James Spencer

In this statement I'm requesting the courts to file this motion to proceed with the case in hand against the three defendants in question for copyright infringement and stealing my material. After investigation and due diligence on my part, I have discovered case law regarding my matter. Also, the law about copyright infringement and what the law actually describes what copyright is. These three individuals placed my videos on Youtube without my consent neither oral or written. All three of them broke the law by doing this. They committed Copyright infringement and perjured themselves by doing counter DMCA's on my videos. What Copyright states, that if a movie, picture, image, and or recording is viewed multiple times by individuals, that is known as fixation. Fixation is repetitive usage of watching, playing, viewing or seeing in a tangible medium more than once of that particular creator's work. I'm the creator of this work and sell these DVDs on Ebay and play them on my website. They are also aired on television. These videos are viewed and produce by me and me only. I choose videos that I want up. So since I'm the creator of these videos, copyright law would protect me from any user trying to reproduce my material without permission. Only works that are fixed in medium are protected, not the ideas nor thoughts behind it. Luis B. Calex, one of the defendants had an image of me from my show about a minute long in his video. Copyright law protects against infringement of pictures or images. Jean Jack Gibson and Harry Benson had videos of my actual show uploaded to Youtube. These defendants broke copyright law by using them without my permission on this medium. Case law that I found was Hi-Tech Video Production INC VERSUS Capital Citig/ABC. Docket number 1:90-CV-1015. In this particular case, a video post card was played on an ABC affiliate station without video productions company's knowledge. They had a Copyright label and rights to this video, perceived by the courts. The courts rewarded the production company statutory compensation of \$ 3, 400 dollars for the television station for airing this video. Dated 1992 in the Michigan federal courts. Another case law in relations to copyright is Robinson vs. Random House Publication in the New York federal courts. In this particular case, the plaintiff copied a book that was already written by the defendant Random House Publishers. This individual set declaration for the courts of ownership in this particular case. When in fact, this user plagiarized himself by copying the book without Random House's notice. Random House won in the New York federal courts because they were the original creators and copyright was proven, Docket number 93civ-3108. In short, I believe that to the best of my ability have proven sufficient amount of evidence to support my filing and plea for the courts to action

accordingly. I hope the honorable Judge is satisfied with my studies and accurate account of the law that is discovered.

For the prayer or relief requested, I would appreciate punitive damages against these three in question. Meaning, that these individuals will not be able to steal my property lawfully or otherwise against my wishes in the future and upload it on any media. Also, I request the courts to use this case to set precedence for any other future case such as this. I will respectfully thank the courts in advance for cooperation in granting and hearing the plea.

Sincerely,

George Alexander Yarid

George Alexander Yarid
1307 Stonycreek Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23238

George Alexander Yancy
1307 Stonycreek Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23238

RICHMOND VA 232

22 MAR 2010 PM 2

United States District Courts (Civil)

701 East Broad Suite 300

Richmond, Virginia

23219

U.S. MARSHALS

INSPECTED

2321931533

